



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

If the cut edges of a split oral end are permitted to reunite, new tentacles develop at the regions of union. Polyps with fourteen tentacles were thus produced, but the repetition of the operation on a fourteen-tentacled hydra resulted in no further increase of tentacles.

Attempts were made to secure heteromorphosis, or reversal of "polarity," by grafting. In several cases tentacles were developed upon an aboral cut surface or a foot upon an oral cut surface, but in all these cases (which the author interprets as heteromorphosis) the pieces whose polarity appeared to be reversed were very small parts of the trunk. In the case of a graft of any considerable length, the free cut end reproduced parts similar to those which had been cut away from it. In the cases of apparent heteromorphosis exhibited by very small fragments of the trunk, can it be proved that there is not a shifting about of the tissues or a migration of cells, so that the regeneration does not really involve a reversal of polarity?

H. W. R.

A Revised Classification of the Enteropneusta.—It is nine years since Spengel's great monograph of this group was published.

A number of important additions to our knowledge have been made in the meantime, and the author now returns to the subject¹ for the purpose of recasting the systematic arrangement of the species, and rectifying certain violations of nomenclature which the monograph contained.

The total number of species has been increased by thirteen, and information about one of the old species, *viz.*, *Ptychodera flava* Eschscholtz, has been largely extended since the publication of the monograph.

A total of twenty-nine species is now recognized by the author. The arrangement of these into families and genera is as follows:

FAMILY I. HARRIMANIIDÆ SPENGL, 1901.

Genus 1. *Harrimania* Ritter, 1900.

" 2. *Dolichoglossus* Spengel, 1893.

" 3. *Stercobalanus* Spengel, 1901.

FAMILY II. GLANDICIPITIDÆ SPENGL, 1901.

Genus 1. *Glandiceps* Spengel, 1901.

" 2. *Spengelia* Willey, 1898.

" 3. *Schizocardium* Spengel, 1891.

¹ Die Benennung der Enteropneusten-Gattungen, *Zool. Jahrbuch*, Abth. für Systematik, Geographie, und Biologie der Thiere, Bd. xv, Heft 2, 1901.

FAMILY III. PTYCHODERIDÆ SPENGEL, 1893.

Genus 1. *Glossobalanus* Spengel, 1901.“ 2. *Balanoglossus* Delle Chiaje, 1929.“ 3. *Ptychodera* Eschscholtz, 1825.

The classification adopted by the author in his monograph was unfortunate in that it conflicted at several points with established rules of nomenclature. For example, the type species of *Ptychodera*, *P. flava* Eschscholtz, 1825, would have been removed by Spengel to a new genus, *Tauroglossus*. Delle Chiaje's well-known species, *Balanoglossus clavigerus*, was likewise deprived of its original generic name and placed in the suggested genus *Tauroglossus*.

Both these pioneer species are now restored to their rightful places as types of the genera to which they were originally assigned.

This latest scheme of classification of the Enteropneusta undoubtedly corresponds nearer to the actual relationship of the species than any other that has been proposed.

As the author remarks, however, the three genera constituting the Harrimaniidæ are certainly considerably less closely related than are those constituting the other two families.

Dolichoglossus in particular, I would remark, is much less close of kin to the other genera of the family than these genera are to each other.

WM. E. RITTER.

Hymenoptera Parasitica Hawaiiensis. — The part of the *Fauna Hawaiiensis* (Vol. I, Part III) dealing with the parasitic Hymenoptera has just come to hand. It is written by Mr. W. H. Ashmead, who has prefaced to the purely descriptive part some very interesting remarks on the Hymenoptera of the Hawaiian group. Of the 128 parasitica enumerated, no less than 87 are described as new; these do not include any which cannot be referred to known families, but eleven genera appear to be endemic. Several of the previously known species are easily recognized as introductions from other parts of the world. Mr. Ashmead suggests that the list as given must quite inadequately represent the actual fauna, “since many of the common parasitic families, which must surely occur, are entirely unrepresented.” Since writing these words, Mr. Ashmead has himself visited the islands, and no doubt he will shortly publish the results of his own collecting; but it may be pointed out that the condition observed is characteristic of oceanic islands in general, and of the Hawaiian Islands in particular, as may be seen by reference to Wallace's *Island Life*, second edition, Chapter XV. Hence,